

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark. Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/783,541	02/20/2004	William J. Pestone	Lehigh.6790 7440		
75	90 10/18/2005	EXAMINER			
COLEMAN SUDOL SAPONE, P.C.			DONOVAN, LINCOLN D		
714 Colorado A Bridgeport, CT		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
Bridgeport, C1			2832		
			DATE MAILED: 10/18/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

/\	
/λ	
$\sim$	

		1	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary			10/783,541	PESTONE, WIL	LIAM J.	
		E	Examiner	Art Unit		
		L	incoln Donovan	2832		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communi r Reply	ication appea	rs on the cover sheet	with the correspondence a	address	
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MASSIONS OF THE MASSION O	AILING DAT of 37 CFR 1.136(i unication. itutory period will a will, by statute, ca	E OF THIS COMMUN a). In no event, however, may apply and will expire SIX (6) M use the application to become	NICATION.  a reply be timely filed  ONTHS from the mailing date of this  ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) file	d on <i>02 Aug</i>	ust 2005.			
·	•		ction is non-final.			
· · ·	Since this application is in condition	<i>,</i> —		atters, prosecution as to the	ne merits is	
-,	closed in accordance with the practic		•	·		
Dispositi	on of Claims					
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the a	polication.				
-	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>3 and 4</u> is/a		n from consideration.			
	Claim(s) <u>9-20</u> is/are allowed.		1			
	Claim(s) <u>1,2 and 5-8</u> is/are rejected.	•	Ť			
-	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
-	Claim(s) are subject to restric	tion and/or e	lection requirement.			
	on Papers					
· —	The specification is objected to by the					
10)∐	The drawing(s) filed on is/are:	•	• - •			
•	Applicant may not request that any object		- · ·	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including				• •	
11)[]	The oath or declaration is objected to	by the Exan	niner. Note the attach	ed Office Action or form F	PTO-152.	
Priority u	inder 35 U.S:C. § 119		•			
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>						
2) Notice 3) Infom	e(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or F No(s)/Mail Date	•	Paper No	v Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date f Informal Patent Application (PT 	ΓΟ-152)	

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

Claims 3-4 and 17 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected claimed invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 08-02-05.

Applicant's election with traverse of claims 1-2, 5-16 and 18-20 in the reply filed on 08-02-05 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that figures 4 and 6 are directed towards the same embodiment. This is found persuasive. The restriction of the embodiments directed towards claims 3-4 and 17 was not traversed.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-2 and 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In line 8, applicant should clarify whether it was intended that the surface area of the plate be greater than the first or second magnet.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Application/Control Number: 10/783,541

Art Unit: 2832

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2 and 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snider [US 6,677,846] in view of Rykaczewski [US 4,633,563].

Snider discloses a device for attracting metal particles [figure 6] comprising:

- a longitudinal member [41] having first and second ends;
- a housing connected to the second end substantially perpendicular to the longitudinal member [figure 6] having a magnet [12] disposed therein
- a plate [14] having a surface area secured to the housing and positioned within a proximity to the magnet to magnetize the plate with the surface area of the plate having a larger square area than that of the magnet.

Snider discloses everything claimed except an additional magnet being connected to the first end of the longitudinal surface.

Rykaczewski discloses a magnet gripper tool [figure 2] having a longitudinal shaft having first and second ends with magnets [8, 35] mounted at each end thereof.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to mount a magnet at the first end of the longitudinal shaft of Snider, as suggested by Rykaczewski, in order to enable the tool to pick up smaller, harder to reach, objects.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snider, as modified, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ottens [US 6,669,024].

Application/Control Number: 10/783,541

Art Unit: 2832

Snider, as modified, disclose everything claimed except the housing being pivotally connected to the second end.

Ottens discloses a magnetic sweeper [10] having a magnetic element [12] attached to an end of a longitudinal member [16] via a pivot connection [figure 1].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Snider, as modified, to use the pivot connection design of Ottens in order to optimize the pickup area of the sweeper.

Claims 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snider, as modified, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Berger [US 6,056,339].

Snider, as modified, disclose everything claimed except the specific mounting of the additional magnet.

Berger discloses mounting a pickup magnet within a cavity of a longitudinal support member [figure 1] being able to be extended beyond the cavity or be flush therewith.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made modify the mounting structure for the magnet on the longitudinal member of Snider, as modified, as suggested by Berger, in order to optimize pick-strength for the particular environment of use.

# Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 9-20 are allowed.

Restricted claim 17 has been rejoined with allowable claim 16.

Application/Control Number: 10/783,541

Art Unit: 2832

#### Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Haase et al. [US 6,142,310], Coleman, Jr. et al. [US 5,945,901], Fader et al. [US 6,677,845], Jameson et al. [US 5,395,148], Hubbard, Jr. [US 5,868,258] and Westermann [US 3,646,492].

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lincoln Donovan whose telephone number is 571-272-1988. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Enad Elvin can be reached on 571-272-1990. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ldd